CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator		Team:	CCRB Case #:		Болоо		Discount	
Investigator:				1	Force	✓	Discourt.	_
Cassandra Fenkel		Squad #6	201804731		Abuse		O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:	-	Pı	recinct:	18	Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Tuesday, 05/08/2018 6:55 PM		Bryant Avenue and Bru 41st Precinct stationhor			41	11	1/8/2019	11/8/2019
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported	:	Date/Time	Rece	ived at CCl	RB
Wed, 06/13/2018 4:50 PM		CCRB	In-person		Wed, 06/1	3/201	8 4:50 PM	[
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ess					
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command					
1. POM Angel Andujar	11969	941348	041 PCT					
2. SGT David Jimenez	774	941964	041 PCT					
3. POM Emilio Estevez	13502	944542	041 PCT					
4. POM Richard Ruiz	18806	962071	041 PCT					
Witness Officer(s)	Shield N	o Tax No	Cmd Name					
1. LT Charles Rodriguez	00000	929065	041 PCT					
2. POM Paul Tambe	12256	961348	041 PCT					
3. POM Christophe Indovino	18914	958716	041 PCT					
Officer(s)	Allegation	on			Inve	stiga	tor Recon	nmendation
A.POM Angel Andujar		at Bryant Avenue and Broolice Officer Angel And						
B.POM Angel Andujar		at Bryant Avenue and Brolice Officer Angel And s property.						
C.POM Angel Andujar	the Bron	esy: At Bryant Avenue a x, Police Officer Angel A cously to §87(2)(b)		vard	in			
D.POM Emilio Estevez		t Bryant Avenue and Broolice Officer Emilio Est						
E.POM Richard Ruiz		t Bryant Avenue and Broolice Officer Richard Ru						
F.POM Angel Andujar	Bronx, P	At Bryant Avenue and Brolice Officer Angel And property.						
G.SGT David Jimenez		at the 41st Precinct static threatened to notify Adn						
H.SGT David Jimenez	Jimenez	At the 41st Precinct static did not process \$\frac{8}{87(2)(b)}\$ g officers.	onhouse, Sergeant D					

Case Summary

Cuse Summary
On June 13, 2019, \$87(2)(b) filed this complaint in-person at the CCRB.
On May 8, 2018, at approximately 6:55 p.m., §87(2)(b) was working as a §87(2)(b)
and transporting \$87(2)(b) -old student, to the library. \$87(2)(b) was
pulled over by PO Angel Andujar of the 41st Precinct at Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard
in the Bronx. PO Andujar issued \$87(2)(6) a summons for disobeying a traffic device.
snatched the summons from PO Andujar's hand, at which point PO Andujar told
that she had an outstanding warrant (Allegation A: Abuse of Authority, \$87(2)(9)
refused to exit her vehicle upon request and PO Andujar allegedly yelled that he
would break \$87(2)(b) s "fucking window" (Allegation B: Abuse of Authority, \$87(2)(9);
Allegation C: Discourtesy, \$87(2)(9) 1. Lieutenant Charles Rodriguez, PO Emilio Estevez, PO Price and additional officers from the 41st President emission of the property of
Richard Ruiz, and additional officers from the 41st Precinct arrived on scene. PO Estevez
allegedly pulled \$87(2)(5) out of her vehicle (Allegation D: Force; \$87(2)(5)) and he and
PO Ruiz allegedly dragged \$87(2)(b) to their vehicle (Allegation D continued, Allegation E:
Force, \$87(2)(9)).
§ 87(2)(b) was arrested for § 87(2)(b) . § 87(2)(b) . § 87(2)(b) . § 87(2)(b)
vehicle was removed to the 41 st Precinct stationhouse (Allegation F: Abuse of Authority ,
§87(2)(9)
was transported to the 41st Precinct stationhouse, where Sgt. David Jimenez
allegedly threatened to call ACS if \$87(2)(b) did not provide the contact information of \$87(2)(b)
s parents (Allegation G: Abuse of Authority, \$87(2)(9) and allegedly refused to
process \$87(2)(b) s complaint regarding officers (Allegation H: Abuse of Authority,
§ 87(2)(g)).
[§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]
provided the CCRB with two cell phone videos she recorded during this
incident. The original footage is located in IA #10 (Board Review 02) and IA #49 (Board Review
03) and is summarized in IA #65 (Board Review 04) and IA #66 (Board Review 05).
Findings and Recommendations
Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: At Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard in the
Bronx, Police Officer Angel Andujar detained §87(2)(b)
Cell phone footage recorded by \$87(2)(b) captures a portion of her interaction with PO
Andujar. In the first video (Board Review 02), \$87(2)(b) speaks with a raised voice and asks
PO Andujar to explain why she was pulled over. PO Andujar, who is holding a summons, tells
how long she has to respond and that all the information is on the back. §87(2)(b)
snatches the summons from PO Andujar's hand. PO Andujar then states, "You know what? Get
out of the vehicle." PO Andujar orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately 10 times
and she refuses to do so, at which point PO Andujar tells §87(2)(b) that she has an active
Warrant. (Poord Povious 06) testified she was driving in the for right lone of Proglemer
(Board Review 06) testified she was driving in the far-right lane of Bruckner Boulevard when she switched lanes without signaling and was pulled over by PO Andujar. PO
Andujar, who was working alone, requested \$87(2)(b) so license and registration, which she
provided after his second request. PO Andujar returned to his vehicle and \$87(2)(b) began
recording on her cell phone. PO Andujar returned to \$87(2)(b) s vehicle with a summons for
Page 2
PANE /

the moving violation and §87(2)(6) snatched it from his hand, along with her license and
registration. PO Andujar then ordered \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle and stated that she was
under arrest for an open warrant. § 87(2)(b) denied that she had an open warrant and told PO
Andujar she would not be going anywhere with him. PO Andujar ordered \$87(2)(b) to exit her
vehicle approximately three more times and she refused to do so.
PO Andujar (Board Review 07) testified that he pulled \$87(2)(b) over and issued her a
summons for disobeying a traffic device for turning in a straight-only lane. While running
\$87(2)(b) s name in the DAS Lite mobile application on his department cell phone, PO Andujar
learned that \$87(2)(b) had an open I-Card related to a robbery. PO Andujar was unable to see
any additional information regarding this I-Card due to a poor connection. PO Andujar returned
to \$87(2)(b) s vehicle with her summons, which \$87(2)(b) snatched from his hand before he
could mention the I-Card. PO Andujar told \$87(2)(0) that she had a warrant, and testified that
he used this word because he did not believe \$87(2)(b) would understand what an I-Card was.
then denied she had a warrant and drove away. Given \$87(2)(b) s denial of having
a warrant and subsequent flight, PO Andujar feared the I-Card was "something serious" and
pursued \$87(2)(b) to the next intersection, where she was ultimately apprehended. PO Andujar
later learned at the 41st Precinct stationhouse that \$87(2)(b) had an active I-Card because she
was a witness to a robbery.
The CCRB confirmed that \$87(2)(5) had an active witness I-Card at the time of this
incident generated by Manhattan Robbery Squad (Board Review 08).
According to NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 208-23 (Board Review 09), the existence of
an investigation card identifying an individual as a witness is insufficient authority to arrest or
involuntarily detain the individual.
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation B – Abuse of Authority: At Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard in the
Bronx, Police Officer Angel Andujar threatened to damage \$87(2)(6) seems s property.
Allegation C – Abuse of Authority: At Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard in the
Bronx, Police Officer Angel Andujar spoke discourteously to \$87(2)(5)
In the second video cell phone video recorded by § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 02), which
appears to begin when the first recording ended, \$87(2)(6) and PO Andujar continue to argue
as to whether she has a warrant. §87(2)(6) tells PO Andujar to have a nice day. For the next 30
seconds, an engine hum, beeping horns, screeching tires, sirens, and other miscellaneous
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately five more times. At 2:00 minute mark, PO Andujar tells \$87(2)(b) "I'll break your fucking"
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately five more times. At 2:00 minute mark, PO Andujar tells \$87(2)(b) "I'll break your fucking"
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately five more times. At 2:00 minute mark, PO Andujar tells \$87(2)(b) "I'll break your fucking window."
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately five more times. At 2:00 minute mark, PO Andujar tells \$87(2)(b) "I'll break your fucking window." \$87(2)(b) denied that she left the location of the initial vehicle stop and testified that
vehicular sounds are heard. PO Andujar then orders \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately five more times. At 2:00 minute mark, PO Andujar tells \$87(2)(b) "I'll break your fucking window." \$87(2)(b) denied that she left the location of the initial vehicle stop and testified that the vehicular sounds in her cell phone video was her beeping at the vehicle in front of her.

he would break the "fucking window." In response, \$87(2)(b) told PO Andujar that she wanted him to break her window so he could "see what [she's] made of." Around this time, the vehicle behind \$87(2)(b) rear-ended her. PO Andujar continued to order \$87(2)(b) to exit her vehicle approximately 15 times. \$87(2)(b) did not exit her vehicle until she was forcibly removed from it.
PO Andujar testified that after \$87(2)(b) and are away, he ordered other vehicles on the roadway to stop to block \$87(2)(b) and in traffic. \$87(2)(b) are then put her vehicle into reverse and hit the vehicle behind her. PO Andujar again ordered \$87(2)(b) are to exit her vehicle approximately four times and she refused to do so. PO Andujar initially did not recall if he threatened to break \$87(2)(b) are swindow and denied using profanity towards her, but identified himself as the officer depicted in \$87(2)(b) are scell phone footage. An accident report (Board Review 10) prepared by PO Andujar documented that \$87(2)(b) are accident report (Board Review 10) prepared to the hospital for injuries. Neither Lieutenant Rodriguez (Board Review 11), PO Tambe (Board Review 12), PO Indovino (Board Review 13), PO Estevez (Board Review 14), nor PO Ruiz (Board Review 15) were present during this aspect of the incident. According to Onderdonk v. State, 170 Misc. 2d 155 (1996) (Board Review 16), officers must give due respect to property but may damage property if doing so is reasonably necessary to carry out their duties. The courts have previously given latitude to officers who used otherwise impolite words to address suspects in stressful street situations. Disciplinary Case Nos. 79627/04
(Board Review 17).
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation D - Force: At Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard in the Bronx, Police
Officer Emilio Estevez used physical force against §87(2)(b) Allegation E – Force: At Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard in the Bronx, Police
Officer Richard Ruiz used physical force against § 87(2)(b)
testified that after she was rear-ended, she stopped recording on her cell phone and called 911 to report the incident. Around this time, approximately 15 additional
officers arrived on scene, surrounded her vehicle, and ordered her to exit from it. [87(2)] -year-old
who had previously been asleep in the front passenger's seat, opened the front
passenger's side door, which caused all of sa7(2)(b) s doors to unlock. PO Estevez, identified by the investigation, grabbed sa7(2)(b) by the back collar of her jacket and pulled her out of
her vehicle. §87(2)(b) fell onto the ground outside. PO Estevez and PO Ruiz, also identified by
the investigation, lifted \$87(2)(b) into a standing position by each of her arms. \$87(2)(b) ordered the officers to get off her, but PO Estevez and PO Ruiz allegedly pushed \$87(2)(b)
Page 4

against her vehicle, causing her chest and face to make contact with it. §87(2)(b) acknowledged
that she was "not complying" at this time but denied that she did anything to physically resist the
officers. §87(2)(b) was handcuffed and escorted to a vehicle by PO Estevez and PO Ruiz. PO
Estevez and PO Ruiz each held onto one of \$87(2)(b) s arms. Though \$67(2)(b) faced the
same direction as PO Estevez and PO Ruiz, she refused to move her legs along with them, and
PO Estevez and PO Ruiz allegedly dragged her feet along the ground. §87(2)(b) alleged that
she sustained pain and bruising to one of her arms, she could not recall which, from the officers
dragging her to their vehicle.
provided a photograph (Board Review 18) taken on May 10, 2018, which depicted a bruise on her bicep. §87(2)(b) s medical records (Board Review 19) document that
she was transported to [587(2)(b)] in police custody, where she complained that officers
pushed her onto the hood of her car and handcuffed her. §87(2)(b) complained of pain to her
wrist, neck, and back. \$87(2)(b) was diagnosed with acute pain due to trauma and discharged
with instructions to take Tylenol and Motrin as needed.
PO Estevez and PO Ruiz each testified that \$87(2)(b) was already handcuffed outside
of her vehicle at the time of their arrival. PO Estevez and PO Ruiz denied pulling \$87(2)(6) out
of her vehicle or pushing her against it, and denied seeing any other officers do so. However,
these allegations have been pleaded to PO Estevez and PO Ruiz as they identified themselves as
the officers who escorted \$87(2)(b) to a vehicle. PO Estevez testified that he and PO Ruiz each grabbed \$87(2)(b) by one of her arms and walked her to their vehicle. PO Estevez did not recall
there being any issue with getting \$87(2)(b) to the vehicle and denied that she was physically
resistant. PO Ruiz was unable to recall the details of how \$87(2)(b) got to their vehicle, but
denied that there was any issue. Both PO Estevez and PO Ruiz denied that they ever dragged
\$87(2)(b) to their vehicle.
Lieutenant Rodriguez testified that upon his arrival, \$87(2)(6) was refusing to exit her
vehicle, which was stopped in the right travel lane of Bruckner Boulevard. \$87(2)(0)
opened one of the vehicle's doors and an officer, Lieutenant Rodriguez could not recall who,
reached inside, grabbed \$87(2)(b) by her arm, and escorted her to the rear of her vehicle.
Lieutenant Rodriguez had no recollection of ever seeing §87(2)(b) on the ground and denied
seeing officers use any physical force on her.
PO Andujar testified that given \$87(2)(b) s continued refusal to exit her vehicle, he
walked away after additional backup officers arrived on scene. PO Adujar stood approximately a
car length away from §87(2)(b) s vehicle and spoke with an unidentified plainclothes. PO
Andujar did not pay attention to §87(2)(b) and did not see the remainder of her interactions
with officers. PO Andujar denied that he saw any officers pull §87(2)(b) from her vehicle, push
her against it, or drag her to a vehicle.
PO Indovino and PO Tambe each testified that they did not see how \$87(2)(b) came to
be outside of her vehicle. Both PO Indovino and PO Tambe denied seeing officers use any
physical force against § 87(2)(b)
Sgt. Jimenez was not present during this aspect of the incident.
According to NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 221-02 (Board Review 20), officers may
use reasonable force under the circumstances to gain control of a person who is resisting being
placed into custody.
§ 87(2)(g)
Davi 5
Page 5

CVC/VC
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation F – Abuse of Authority: At Bryant Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard in the
Bronx, Police Officer Angel Andujar seized §87(2)(b) s property.
\$87(2)(b) testified that her 2017 grey Mercedes Benz \$87(2)(b) was seized pursuant to
her arrest. \$87(2)(b) was interviewed at the CCRB on June 20, 2018, and as of that date, her
vehicle remained in police custody. \$87(2)(b) also acknowledged that at the time of her arrest,
which occurred during rush hour on a Tuesday, she was driving in a three-lane section of Brucker
Boulevard with no shoulder, and the sole occupant of her vehicle was \$87(2)(b) -old \$87(2)(b)
PO Andujar corroborated that he seized \$87(2)(b) s vehicle and subsequently
vouchered (Board Review 21) it as arrest evidence.
According to NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 218-12 (Board Review 22), when
necessary, officers may safeguard vehicles in police custody at the stationhouse.
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation G – Abuse of Authority: At the 41st Precinct stationhouse, Sergeant David
Jimenez threatened to notify Administration for Children's Services.
testified that at the 41st Precinct stationhouse, Sgt. Jimenez requested the
phone number of \$87(2)(b) s parents. \$87(2)(b) refused to provide this information. Sgt.
phone number of spacetis.
Jimenez allegedly told \$87(2)(b) that he would have to call ACS if he could not reach \$87(2)(b)
s parents, at which point \$87(2)(b) provided him with their contact information.
Sgt. Jimenez (Board Review 23) had no recollection of discussing \$87(2)(b) with
Sgt. Jimenez did not recall if he ever told \$87(2)(b) that he would call ACS if he
could not reach \$87(2)(b) s parents, but stated that procedurally, an officer would be
required to notify ACS if they cannot reach the parent or guardian of a minor child in their care.
According to NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 215-02 (Board Review 24), an officer is
required to notify ACS if a child is not claimed from the stationhouse within a reasonable amount
of time.
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation H – Abuse of Authority: At the 41st Precinct stationhouse, Sergeant David
Jimenez did not process §87(2)(b) s complaint regarding officers.
testified that she told Sgt. Jimenez she wanted to file a "verbal complaint"
and that she planned to call IAB and the CCRB upon her release from police custody. §87(2)(b)
Page 6
i age o

explained that she used the term verbal complaint because she did not know she could file a written complaint at the stationhouse, though she would have liked to have done so. Sgt. Jimenez that he would investigate the incident further and take her complaint, but no CCRB complaint was ever filed on her behalf. Sgt. Jimenez testified that § 87(2)(b) complained about having to go to Central Booking but did not recall §87(2)(b) stating that she wanted to file a complaint. Sgt. Jimenez denied that he ever failed to process \$87(2)(b) s complaint regarding officers. PO Andujar testified that he spoke with Sgt. Jimenez, who told him that that he spoke to and she requested medical attention for injuries sustained during her arrest. was ultimately transported to the hospital. PO Andujar denied that Sgt. Jimenez said anything regarding § 87(2)(b) wanting to file a complaint regarding officers. Neither Lieutenant Rodriguez, PO Tambe, PO Indovino, PO Estevez, nor PO Ruiz were present during this aspect of the incident. **Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories**

Page 7

•		service for 12 years and has been a sallegations, none of which were subst	•
	§ 87(2)(g)	,	07/2
•	CCRB complaints and 11 allegatio 201406842 involved substa (interference with a civilia discourtesy (word) against Estevez was found not gui	service for 11 years and has been a suns, of which two were substantiated: antiated allegations of an abuse of aun's ability to photograph the incident PO Estevez. The Board recommendaty.	thority – other) and a ed charges and PO
•		ns, none of which were substantiated	
•	_	f service for 12 years and has been a sallegations, none of which were sub	-
•	A •	r mediation. pmitted to the New York City Office will be included in the case file upon	
Squad	No.: #6		
Investi	gator:Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad	Leader:Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Review	ver:		
110 / 10 /	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
		Page 8	
	CCRR	Case # 201804731	
Investi	gator: Signature Leader: Signature ver: Signature	Print Title & Name Print Title & Name	Date

§ 87(2)(b)

Page 9